UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,576	05/25/2000	DAPHNA HAVKIN-FRENKEL	13253-00001	5251

7590 06/03/2002

JANET E. REED, ESQ.
WOODCOCK WASHBURN, LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE
46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
COLLINS, CYNTHIA E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1638	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/462,576	HAVKIN-FRENKEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cynthia Collins	1638	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 March 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10 and 31-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 9-10 and 31-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment filed March 19, 2002, paper no.13, has been entered.

Claim 8 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9 and 10 have been newly amended.

Claims 31-40 have been newly added.

Claims 1-7, 9-10 and 31-40 are pending.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

The objection to claim 1 is withdrawn in light of the amendment of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-7 and 9-10 remain rejected and claims 31-40 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for improving production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells by supplementing the culture with 3% malic acid alone, 1 mM 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde alone, or 30 ug/mL glycosylated lysozyme elicitor protein alone, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for improving production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells by supplementing the culture with malic acid, 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, citric acid, pyruvic acid, oxaloacetic acid, succinic acid, glycosylated lysozyme elicitor protein, and any combination thereof, for the reasons of record set forth in the office action mailed September 6, 2002. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is

most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant's arguments filed March 19, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that in general the Examiner should not use post-filing date references to demonstrate that a patent is nonenabling, and that exceptions to this rule could occur if a later dated reference provides evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known on or before the effective filing date. Applicant argues that Rao et al. does not directly provide evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known, but puts forth assertions and interpretations of the evidence of what one skilled in the art knew when the instant application was filed (reply page 12).

Applicant points out that the first section relied upon in the cited reference of Rao et al. relates to the use of phytohormones. Applicant argues that that the study cited by Rao et al. on the use of a hormone mix containing 2,4-D and benzyl adenine does not provide any direct evidence of the effect of on vanillin production. Applicant argues that the study cited by Rao et al. on the use of napthalene acetic acid with or without cytokinins does not provide any evidence of the effect of on vanillin production (reply page 12). Additionally, Applicant argues that although Rao et al. cites a study in which kinetin was successfully used to induce vanillin acid synthesis, the claims do not contain any element or require any limitation relating to any phytohormones. Applicant points out that none of the compounds recited in the claims are considered to be phytohormones. Applicant further points out that Rao et al. do not cite any

evidence to suggest the unpredictability of any of the compounds recited in the claims (reply page 13).

Applicant also points out that Rao et al. cite a study in which feeding cinnamic acid and ferulic acid to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures result in the formation of p-hydroxybenzoic acid and vanillic acid, a study in which the use of conditioned media results in a two fold increase in vanillin production, a study in which the use of ferulic acid results in 1.7 fold increase in vanillin production, a study in which the use of light had little or no effect on the production of p-hydroxybenzoic acid, p-hydroxybenzyl alcohol, p-hydroxybenzaldehyde, and p-coumaric acid, a study in which the use of phenylalanine and ferulic acid had little effect on vanillin production but the use of vanillyl alcohol significantly increased vanillin production, and a study in which the use of charcoal increased vanillin production. (reply pages 13-14). Applicant argues that the claims do not recite or require any limitation relating to cinnamic acid, ferulic acid, phenyalanine, charcoal absorbents or light intensity, and that the Examiner has either misconstrued the claims or read into the claims a limitation which is not contained within them. Applicant points out that none of the compounds recited in the claims are cited by Rao et al., and that Rao et al. does not suggest the unpredictability of any of the claimed compounds (reply page 14).

Applicant also argues that when presented with similar facts, The Patent Office Board of Appeals reversed an examiner's enablement rejection of claims related to processes for using monoclonal antibodies to isolated and purify human fibroblasts (*Ex Parte Erlich*) (reply page 15).

Applicant argues that the Examiner has stated no reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained within the specification, and has provided only the post filing reference of Rao et al. (reply page 15). Applicant argues that the specification teaches the addition of specific compounds to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures to improve vanillin production, the preferred concentrations or amounts of compounds to be added, and sets forth multiple examples in which vanillin production is improve. In particular, Applicant points to Example 3 on page 24, and Example 4 on page 25. Applicant argues that the specification details routine methods for the culture of *Vanilla planifolia*, and routine methods for the analysis of various metabolic intermediates. Applicant argues that collectively the teachings set forth in the specification allow one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention (reply page 16).

Applicant argues that undue experimentation is not required to practice the claimed invention, and that the Examiner's rejection is improperly based on phytohormones and the use of vanillin precursors, neither of which are claimed or required. Applicant argues that ample and in fact multiple working examples are provided, that guidance with respect to how to culture *Vanilla planifolia*, how to assay products and intermediates, working ranges of concentrations or amounts of compounds to add, what to avoid, and preferred additions and combinations. Applicant argues that while a certain amount of experimentation may be useful to practice the claimed invention, it is not undue experimentation (reply page 17).

Applicant asserts that while the level of skill in the art is high, Applicant does not agree that the art with respect to the claimed invention is unpredictable. Applicant argues that only routine experimentation is required to add the claimed compounds to a culture and measure vanillin production by routine methods, and that the art of adding compounds to a culture for

improvement of a metabolic pathway is not an unpredictable technology in the early stages of development. Applicant argues that the addition of such compounds and the optimization of parameters are well within the grasp of one skilled in the art. (reply page 18).

The Examiner maintains that although the cited reference of Rao et al. was published after the effective filing date of the instant application, Rao et al. does provide evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known on or before the effective filing date. Rao et al. is a review article that contains a summary of studies, some of which are directed to biotechnological methods for the production of vanillin using *Vanilla* cell cultures The summarized studies directed to biotechnological methods for the production of vanillin using *Vanilla* cell cultures were published before the effective filing date of the instant application.

The Rao et al. reference was cited to demonstrate the unpredictability of the effect of different compounds on the production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. Regarding the studies summarized by Rao et al. relating to the use of phytohormones, both the use of a hormone mix containing 2,4-D and benzyl adenine and the use of napthalenacetic acid with or without cytokinins provide indirect evidence of an effect of on vanillin production. 2,4-D suppressed secondary metabolism, and vanillin is a product of secondary metabolism. Napthalenacetic acid increased the production of extractable phenolics, and the production of vanillin is determined by the pathway into which phenolic compounds are directed. The Examiner acknowledges that none of the compounds recited in the instant claims are currently considered to be phytohormones, and that Rao et al. do not cite any of the compounds recited in the instant claims. However, the unpredictability of the effect of phytohormones on vanillin

production is relevant to the instant invention in so far as phytohormones are routinely employed in the culture of *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

Regarding the studies summarized by Rao et al. relating to the use of vanillin precursors, the Examiner acknowledges that none of the compounds recited in the instant claims are cited by Rao et al. The Examiner points out, however, that one of the compounds recited in the instant claims, 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, is considered to be the immediate precursor of vanillin (specification, page 12, lines 31-33). The Examiner has neither misconstrued the claims nor read into the claims a limitation which is not contained within them. The Rao et al. reference was cited to demonstrate the unpredictability of the effect of different compounds on the production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. The unpredictability of the effect of other vanillin precursors on vanillin production is relevant to the instant invention in so far as the instant invention claims the use of the vanillin precursor 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde.

The Examiner also maintains that the facts in *Ex Parte Erlich* are not similar to the instant facts. In *Ex Parte Erlich*,The Patent Office Board of Appeals reversed an examiner's enablement rejection of claims related to processes for using monoclonal antibodies to isolated and purify human fibroblasts. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-17 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, "as being nonenabled in that the original disclosure does not set forth the amount of human fibrobast interferon used in one of the screening assays used to determine production of monoclonal antibodies by hybrid cell lines". The Patent Office Board of Appeals found that enablement of the preliminary screening assay was not an issue because the claims on appeal did not require the use of the assay in dispute. In the instant case claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a

method for improving production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells by supplementing the culture with 3% malic acid alone, 1 mM 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde alone, or 30 ug/mL glycosylated lysozyme elicitor protein alone, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for improving production of vanillin in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells by supplementing the culture with malic acid, 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, citric acid, pyruvic acid, oxaloacetic acid, succinic acid, glycosylated lysozyme elicitor protein, and any combination thereof. In the instant case, the amount and combination of compounds used to supplement the cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells are recited in the claims.

The Examiner maintains that the unpredictability of a compound or combination of compounds improving vanillin production in cultured cells is a reasonable basis to question the scope of enablement, and that the post-filing reference of Rao et al. does provide evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known on or before the effective filing date.

With respect to what is taught in the specification, in general the specification teaches supplementing *Vanilla planifolia* cultures with the claimed compounds, alone or in combination, "in an amount effective to improve vanillin production" (page 3 lines 25-34). The specification teaches preferred embodiments of supplementing cultures with (1) malic acid between about 0.01% to 0.50% by weight, (2) 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde between about 0.1 and 5.0 mM, (3) about 0.01% to about 5.0% by weight of a compound selected from the group consisting of succinic acid, oxaloacetic acid, citric acid and pyruvic acid, and (4) about 1 to about 100ug/ml glycosylated lysozyme (page 4 lines 1-11). The specification does not teach other effective amounts for the recited compounds, or effective amounts for the compounds when used in

combination. The specification teaches that cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells "produced by the aforementioned method" produce at least twice as much, preferably at least ten times as much, and most preferably at least 50 to 100 times as much vanillin as untreated cells (page 4 lines 1-21). The specification does not teach which of the aforementioned preferred embodiments, if any, result in such production of vanillin by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

With respect to working examples, the specification provides only three examples, each illustrating the effect of a single concentration of a single compound on the production of vanillin by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. Example 3 teaches the addition of 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures, with the results being set forth in Example 5. Example 5 provides data for a single concentration of 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, 1.0 mM, and indicates that the addition of 1.0 mM 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures results in an increase in vanillin production from 0.01 mg/100g dry weight in control cells to 16.7 mg/100g dry weight in treated cells (page 26 Table 1). Example 4 teaches the addition of malic acid to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures, with the results being set forth in Table 6. Table 6 provides data for a single concentration of malic acid, 3.0%, and indicates that the addition 3.0% malic acid to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures results in an increase in vanillin production from 0.005 percent of dry weight in control cells to 0.072 percent of dry weight in treated cells (page 29 Table 6). Additionally, in Example 5, Table 5 provides data for a single concentration of glycosylated lysozyme, 30 ug/ml, and indicates that the addition 30 ug/ml glycosylated lysozyme to *Vanilla planifolia* cultures results in an increase in vanillin production from 3.6 mg/100g dry weight in control cells to 8.4 mg/100g dry weight in treated cells (page 29 Table 5). The specification does not teach the effect of other concentrations of 3,4-

dihydroxybenzaldehyde, malic acid, or glycosylated lysozyme on the production of vanillin by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. The specification does not teach the effect of succinic acid, oxaloacetic acid, citric acid or pyruvic acid on the production of vanillin by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. The specification does not teach the effect of any combination of the claimed compounds on the production of vanillin by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

While the art of adding compounds to a cell culture may well be within the grasp of one skilled in the art, and while the determination of vanillin production may be routine, the art of determining which compound(s) to add to a *Vanilla planifolia* culture to improve vanillin production, in what quantity and in what combination, is an unpredictable technology. The prior art of record does not explicitly teach the use of any of these compounds for the improvement of vanillin production in cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. The specification does not provide sufficient guidance for one skilled in the art to determine, without undue experimentation, how much and what combination of 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, citric acid, pyruvic acid, oxaloacetic acid, succinic acid, and glycosylated lysozyme to add to a *Vanilla planifolia* culture to increase vanillin production, or to produce cells that produce at least twice as much vanillin or ten times as much vanillin as unsupplemented cells, other than the amounts disclosed in the specification. The undue experimentation does not lie in the method of adding the compounds to the culture, or in the method for determining vanillin production, the undue experimentation lies in determining the amounts and combinations of compounds to add to the cultures such that vanillin production is increased, or such that the cells produce at least twice as much vanillin or ten times as much vanillin as unsupplemented cells.

The rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in the recitation of "glycosylated lysozyme" in claim 1 and "glycosylated lysozyme elicitor" in claim 7 is withdrawn in light of the amendment of claims 1 and 7 and the specification.

The rejection of claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in the recitation of "at least" is withdrawn in light of Applicant's assertion that the phrase is meant to establish a lower limit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 9 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knuth et al (US 5,057,424, 15 October 1991, Applicant's IDS), for the reasons of record set forth in the office action mailed September 6, 2002.

Applicant's arguments filed March 19, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Knuth et al. do not disclose any embryo cultures per se, nor do they teach cell cultures with the addition of the claimed supplements or elicitors. Applicant further argues that Knuth et al. do not teach cultures with specific limitations on the amount of increased vanillin production. Applicant argues that Knuth et al. do not address or consider the further limitations of claims 9 and 10, "wherein the cells produce at least twice as much vanillin as cells cultured under equivalent conditions but which are not supplemented with the compounds", and "wherein the cells produce at least ten times as much vanillin as cells cultured under equivalent

conditions but which are not supplemented with the compounds". Applicant argues that varying the time a culture is incubated would readily be recognized by one skilled in the art as modifying culture conditions, whereas the claims of the instant invention limit the culture to producing the required increase in vanillin in comparison to a culture grown under equivalent conditions but without the additional compounds or supplements. (reply page 20). Applicant argues that there is no teaching or suggestion in Knuth et al. to accomplish this, and that the teachings of Knuth et al. as they relate to the instant invention are not presented in the same level of detail as the teachings of the instant disclosure. Applicant argues that the Examiner is either misconstruing the limitations of the present invention, or reading into the claims a limitation which is not present. (reply page 21).

The Examiner maintains that original claims 8-10 and amended claims 9 and 10 are not drawn to embryo cultures per se, but are drawn to cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells produced by the method of claim 1, in which a "tissue culture" of *Vanilla planifolia* is provided. Original claims 8-10 and amended claims 9 and 10 are not drawn to cell cultures with the addition of the supplements or elicitors as defined by the claims, but are drawn to cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells. Knuth et al teach cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

Additionally, Knuth et al. does address the further limitation of claims 9 and 10, "wherein the cells produce at least twice as much vanillin as cells cultured under equivalent conditions but which are not supplemented with the compounds", and "wherein the cells produce at least ten times as much vanillin as cells cultured under equivalent conditions but which are not supplemented with the compounds". The variation in the amount of vanillin produced by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells set forth in column 15 lines 55-60 of Knuth et al. implicitly

addresses this limitation in that the variation observed is sufficient to account for an increase in vanillin content that meets the claim limitations.

Furthermore, while varying the time a culture is incubated may be readily be recognized by one skilled in the art as modifying culture conditions, claims 9 and 10 are not drawn to modifying culture conditions. Claims 9 and 10 are drawn to cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

The Examiner is neither misconstruing the limitations of the present invention nor reading into the claims a limitation which is not present. A claim to a product made by a process is not limited to products produced by the process recited in the claim. Any prior art that teaches the product anticipates the product, regardless of the process by which the product is made. Knuth et al. teach cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells that anticipate the claimed cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells.

Newly added claims 31-32, 34-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knuth et al (US 5,057,424, 15 October 1991, Applicant's IDS).

Claim 31 is drawn to a cell culture comprising *Vanilla planifolia* cells supplemented with elicitors of vanillin selected from the group consisting of malic acid, 3,4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde, citric acid, pyruvic acid, oxaloacetic acid, succinic acid, glycosylated lysozyme, and any combination thereof. Claim 32 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 31 wherein the supplementation is of an amount sufficient to increase the production of vanillin. Claim 34 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 31 wherein the cells are root cells. Claim 35 is drawn to a cell culture comprising *Vanilla planifolia* cells in a medium with additions for stimulating vanillin production selected from the group consisting of malic acid, 3,4-

dihydroxybenzaldehyde, citric acid, pyruvic acid, oxaloacetic acid, succinic acid, glycosylated lysozyme, and any combination thereof. Claim 36 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 35 wherein the supplementation is of an amount sufficient to increase the production of vanillin. Claim 37 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 35 wherein the cell culture produces at least two times a s much vanillin than a cell culture under identical conditions wherein the medium lacks additions. Claim 38 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 35 wherein the cell culture produces at least ten times a s much vanillin than a cell culture under identical conditions wherein the medium lacks additions, Claim 40 is drawn to the cell culture of claim 35 wherein the cells are root cells.

Knuth et al. teach a cell culture comprising *Vanilla planifolia* cells obtained from root tips, said culture being supplemented with 10 mg/L malic acid (columns 13-14 Example 2). Knuth et al. also teach that the amount of vanillin produced by cultured *Vanilla planifolia* cells is variable (column 15 lines 55-60). An increase the production of vanillin by these cells was observed, said production increasing from 1.8 mg/L to 18 mg/L (column 15 Example 5). The claimed cell cultures comprising *Vanilla planifolia* cells do not differ from the cell cultures taught by Knuth et al.

Accordingly, newly added claims 31-32, 34-38 and 40 are anticipated by Knuth et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Remarks

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia Collins whose telephone number is (703) 605-1210. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:45 AM -5:15 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson can be reached on (703) 306-3218. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

CC
May 30, 2002

ELIZABETH F. McELWAIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600